



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/594,124

09/25/2006

David Roxburgh

36-2015

8934

23117

7590

04/03/2009

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

VU, BAID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/03/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/594,124	Applicant(s) ROXBURGH ET AL.	
	Examiner Bai D. Vu	Art Unit 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6,8 and 16-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6,8 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/28/2009 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant has amended claims 5, 8, 16 and 17 in the amendment filed on 1/28/2009.

Claims 2-6, 8 and 16-18 are pending in this office action.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 1/28/2009 with respect to claims 2-6, 8 and 16-18 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully traverses applicant's arguments.

Notes

4. With respect to **claims 16 and 17** which are system claim and method claim respectively, the recited sub-systems such as PC, handset and mobile telephones are interpreted as physical devices inherently tied to a machine or apparatus as taken in view of applicant's argument in the Remarks on page 12 lines 1-16 filed on 1/28/2009 and Figure 2. Therefore, claims 2-6, 8, 16 and 17 are statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Regarding to applicant arguments:

- Applicant asserted, on pages 12-15 that Grantges, Jr. et al. (US Pat. No. 6,510,464 B1), hereinafter Grantges, does not teach any notifications being sent from a notification server on behalf of a service behind the gateway.

In response to applicant's argument, examiner respectfully disagrees because Grantges discloses as cited herein *FIGS. 1 and 2; gateway proxy server 40 in turn passes information from the digital certificate tendered by the user of client computer 22 to authorization server 46, preferably in accordance with the LDAP protocol. Authorization server 46 returns authentication data indicative of whether the provided digital certificate successfully authenticates the user of client computer 22, as well as the identification of the applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 to which access by the user 18 has been authorized. This information is returned, in a manner to be described in greater detail below, to DMZ proxy server 34 by gateway proxy server 40 by message 74. When the user is authorized for multiple applications, the user's browser is redirected to*

server 44. Client computer 22 requests, by way of message 76, resources from gateway web server 44. Gateway web server 44 serves up the requested resource, namely an "options page", to client computer 22 in message 78. The "options page" presents a list of authorized applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 for selection by user 18 of client computer 22. The selection of one of the applications presented on the "options page" results in a message 80 being sent to DMZ proxy server 34. Message 80 is an HTTP command (over secure connection 54, thus HTTPS) that includes a composite URL comprising a base URL and an appended identifier. DMZ proxy server 34 routes message 80, based on the composite URL, to gateway proxy server in a message 82. The identifier is sufficient for gateway proxy server 40 to route message 82 to the selected application 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 (col. 9 lines 6-34); and as described above, authorization server 46 returns authentication data to gateway proxy server 40 indicative of whether the tendered digital certificate successfully authenticated the user 18 of client computer 22, as well as an identification of applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 for which access is authorized. In response thereto, gateway proxy server 40 builds authentication cookie 90, and applications list cookie 92. Authentication cookie 90 may include information such as timestamp information indicating a time of successful authentication. Applications list cookie 92 may include an identification of the particular applications for which client computer 22 is authorized. If only one application is authorized, selected application cookie 94 is built containing a description of that

application. If there are a plurality of authorized applications, however, creation of the selected-application cookie 94 is deferred until after user 18 actually selects one of the applications from the "options page". The authentication cookie 90 and the application list cookie 92 are sent with message 74 to client computer 22 via DMZ proxy server 34, with a redirect to web server 44 (col. 10 lines 6-25)

wherein the DMZ proxy server and the gateway proxy server are read on the claimed gateway included notification server 220 in Figure 2; and message 74 included information about the identification of the applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 to which access by the user 18 has been authorized interpreted as notification means.

- Applicant asserted, on pages 16-17 that Grantges does not teach the features of independent claims 16 and 17; thus the rejections of claims 3-6 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are improper because the deficiencies of Grantges are not disclosed by Gupta et al. (6,763,384 B1) in the rejections of claims 3, 6 and 18; Nishizawa et al. (6,081,906 A) in the rejection of claim 4; and Osterman (5,935,211 A) in the rejection of claim 5.

In response to applicant's argument, examiner respectfully disagrees because Grantges discloses the argued limitations in independent claims 16 and 17 as discussed above. Thus, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 to claims 3, 6 and 18 as being obvious over the teachings of Grantges in view of Gupta et al.; claim 4 as being obvious over the teachings of Grantges in view of Nishizawa et

Art Unit: 2165

al.; and as being obvious over the teachings of Grantges in view of Osterman are proper.

Furthermore, applicant is reminded that the examiner is entitled to the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. The Applicants always have the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969). Therefore, the aforementioned assertion is moot.

In light of the foreground arguments, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 103 rejections are hereby sustained.

Claims 2, 8, 16 and 17 are rejected as being anticipated by Grantges.

Claims 3, 6 and 18 are rejected as obvious over the teachings of Grantges in view of Gupta et al..

Claim 4 is rejected as obvious over the teachings of Grantges in view of Nishizawa et al..

Claim 5 is rejected as obvious over the teachings of Grantges in view of Osterman.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 2, 8, 16 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grantges, Jr. et al. (US Pat. No. 6,510,464 B1), hereinafter Grantges.

As per **claim 16**, Grantges discloses “a system comprising:

“programmed computer devices which execute program code to provide a first sub-system and a gateway for offering services provided by the first sub-system to one or more application hosting sub-systems via the gateway and a data communications network between said gateway and sub-systems;” as cited herein *FIGS. 1 and 2*; and *computer system 20 is configured generally to provide access by user 18 of a client computer 22 to one of a plurality of software applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3. Such access is over an insecure network 26, such as the publicly used Internet, to a private, secure network where applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 reside. Each application 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 includes a respective web server (hereinafter "destination server") 28.sub.1, 28.sub.2, . . . , 28.sub.3, and an application program 30.sub.1, 30.sub.2, . . . , 30.sub.3. Computer system 20 includes a firewall system 32, a proxy server 34 with a plug-in 36, an application gateway 38 comprising a gateway proxy server 40 with a plug-in 42 and a*

gateway web server 44, and an authorization server 46 (col. 4 lines 7-19) wherein the gateway proxy server are read on the claimed gateway included notification server 220 in Figure 2; and user 18 of a client computer 22 interpreted as application hosting sub-system; and web servers 28.sub.1, 28.sub.2, . . . , 28.sub.3 interpreted as first sub-systems.

“the gateway and each application hosting sub-system being arranged to permit each application hosting sub-system to initiate a secure and authenticated connection from each application hosting sub-system to the gateway via a non-secure data network connection, and” as cited herein FIGS. 1 and 2; proxy server 34 is disposed on the insecure public network side of firewall system 32, in a so-called Demilitarized Zone (DMZ). A DMZ is located between the insecure network 26 (e.g., the Internet) and the private network's first line of defense, for example, firewall system 32. DMZ proxy server 34 is disposed between client computer 22 and the real servers associated with the substantive applications, namely, destination servers 28.sub.1, 28.sub.2, . . . , 28.sub.3. Proxy servers in general may be characterized as providing both mapping and data caching functions. In the context of the present invention, DMZ proxy server 34 is provided principally for mapping purposes (col. 5 line 58 to col. 6 line 2); application gateway 38 is disposed on the private network side of firewall system 32, between DMZ proxy server 34 and applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3. Gateway 38 includes gateway proxy server 40 and gateway web server 44 (col. 6 lines 37-40); and gateway proxy server 40 is further configured to establish third secure connection 56 within gateway 38 with web server 44. Connection 56 may be established as described

above with respect to secure connection 54. Web server 44 is configured to store various HTML files and graphics, which will be served to client computer 22. In particular, the HTML and graphic files associated with computer system 20 authentication and authorization administration are resident on application gateway server 38. More particularly, web server 44 is configured to provide an "options page" to client computer 22 when user 18 is authenticated and authorized for more than one of applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 (col. 7 lines 9-21).

"the gateway being logically connected to the first sub-system to enable the services provided by the first sub-system to be provided to each application hosting sub-system via a secured and authenticated connection," as cited herein FIG. 2; and client computer 22 requests, by way of message 76, resources from gateway web server 44. Gateway web server 44 serves up the requested resource, namely an "options page", to client computer 22 in message 78. The "options page" presents a list of authorized applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 for selection by user 18 of client computer 22. The selection of one of the applications presented on the "options page" results in a message 80 being sent to DMZ proxy server 34. Message 80 is an HTTP command (over secure connection 54, thus HTTPS) that includes a composite URL comprising a base URL and an appended identifier. DMZ proxy server 34 routes message 80, based on the composite URL, to gateway proxy server in a message 82. The identifier is sufficient for gateway proxy server 40 to route message 82 to the selected application 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 (col. 9 lines 19-35).

“the gateway including notification means for notifying one or more of the application hosting sub-systems that it should initiate a secure authenticated connection with the gateway when the notification means is requested so to do by any one of the services offered by the first sub-system” as cited herein *FIGS. 1 and 2*; gateway proxy server 40 in turn passes information from the digital certificate tendered by the user of client computer 22 to authorization server 46, preferably in accordance with the LDAP protocol. Authorization server 46 returns authentication data indicative of whether the provided digital certificate successfully authenticates the user of client computer 22, as well as the identification of the applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 to which access by the user 18 has been authorized. This information is returned, in a manner to be described in greater detail below, to DMZ proxy server 34 by gateway proxy server 40 by message 74. When the user is authorized for multiple applications, the user's browser is redirected to server 44. Client computer 22 requests, by way of message 76, resources from gateway web server 44. Gateway web server 44 serves up the requested resource, namely an "options page", to client computer 22 in message 78. The "options page" presents a list of authorized applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 for selection by user 18 of client computer 22. The selection of one of the applications presented on the "options page" results in a message 80 being sent to DMZ proxy server 34. Message 80 is an HTTP command (over secure connection 54, thus HTTPS) that includes a composite URL comprising a base URL and an appended identifier. DMZ proxy server 34 routes message 80, based on the composite URL, to gateway proxy server in a message 82. The identifier is sufficient for gateway proxy

server 40 to route message 82 to the selected application 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 (col. 9 lines 6-34); and as described above, authorization server 46 returns authentication data to gateway proxy server 40 indicative of whether the tendered digital certificate successfully authenticated the user 18 of client computer 22, as well as an identification of applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 for which access is authorized. In response thereto, gateway proxy server 40 builds authentication cookie 90, and applications list cookie 92. Authentication cookie 90 may include information such as timestamp information indicating a time of successful authentication. Applications list cookie 92 may include an identification of the particular applications for which client computer 22 is authorized. If only one application is authorized, selected application cookie 94 is built containing a description of that application. If there are a plurality of authorized applications, however, creation of the selected-application cookie 94 is deferred until after user 18 actually selects one of the applications from the "options page". The authentication cookie 90 and the application list cookie 92 are sent with message 74 to client computer 22 via DMZ proxy server 34, with a redirect to web server 44 (col. 10 lines 6-25) wherein the DMZ proxy server and the gateway proxy server are read on the claimed gateway included notification server 220 in Figure 2; and message 74 included information about the identification of the applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 to which access by the user 18 has been authorized interpreted as notification means.

As per **claim 17**, Grantges discloses “a method of offering services provided by a first sub-system to one or more application hosting sub-systems via a gateway, the gateway and each application hosting sub-system being arranged to permit each application hosting sub-system to initiate a secure and authenticated connection from each application hosting sub-system to the gateway via a non-secure data network connection, and the gateway being logically connected to the first sub-system to enable the services provided by the first sub-system to be provided to each application hosting sub-system via a secured and authenticated connection,” as cited herein *FIGS. 1 and 2*; *computer system 20 is configured generally to provide access by user 18 of a client computer 22 to one of a plurality of software applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3. Such access is over an insecure network 26, such as the publicly used Internet, to a private, secure network where applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 reside. Each application 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 includes a respective web server (hereinafter "destination server") 28.sub.1, 28.sub.2, . . . , 28.sub.3, and an application program 30.sub.1, 30.sub.2, . . . , 30.sub.3. Computer system 20 includes a firewall system 32, a proxy server 34 with a plug-in 36, an application gateway 38 comprising a gateway proxy server 40 with a plug-in 42 and a gateway web server 44, and an authorization server 46 (col. 4 lines 7-19) wherein user 18 of a client computer 22 interpreted as application hosting sub-system; and web servers 28.sub.1, 28.sub.2, . . . , 28.sub.3 interpreted as first sub-systems; proxy server 34 is disposed on the insecure public network side of firewall system 32, in a so-called Demilitarized Zone (DMZ). A DMZ is located between the insecure network 26 (e.g., the*

Internet) and the private network's first line of defense, for example, firewall system 32.

DMZ proxy server 34 is disposed between client computer 22 and the real servers associated with the substantive applications, namely, destination servers 28.sub.1, 28.sub.2, . . . , 28.sub.3. Proxy servers in general may be characterized as providing both mapping and data caching functions. In the context of the present invention, DMZ proxy server 34 is provided principally for mapping purposes (col. 5 line 58 to col. 6 line 2); application gateway 38 is disposed on the private network side of firewall system 32, between DMZ proxy server 34 and applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3.

Gateway 38 includes gateway proxy server 40 and gateway web server 44 (col. 6 lines 37-40); and gateway proxy server 40 is further configured to establish third secure connection 56 within gateway 38 with web server 44. Connection 56 may be established as described above with respect to secure connection 54. Web server 44 is configured to store various HTML files and graphics, which will be served to client computer 22. In particular, the HTML and graphic files associated with computer system 20 authentication and authorization administration are resident on application gateway server 38. More particularly, web server 44 is configured to provide an "options page" to client computer 22 when user 18 is authenticated and authorized for more than one of applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 (col. 7 lines 9-21) "the method comprising:"

"sending a request from a service wishing to set up a secure and authenticated connection to an application hosting sub-system that the notification means send a notification to a respective application hosting sub-system to notify it that it should

initiate a secure authenticated connection with the gateway;" as cited herein *FIGS. 1 and 2*; gateway proxy server 40 in turn passes information from the digital certificate tendered by the user of client computer 22 to authorization server 46, preferably in accordance with the LDAP protocol. Authorization server 46 returns authentication data indicative of whether the provided digital certificate successfully authenticates the user of client computer 22, as well as the identification of the applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 to which access by the user 18 has been authorized. This information is returned, in a manner to be described in greater detail below, to DMZ proxy server 34 by gateway proxy server 40 by message 74. When the user is authorized for multiple applications, the user's browser is redirected to server 44. Client computer 22 requests, by way of message 76, resources from gateway web server 44. Gateway web server 44 serves up the requested resource, namely an "options page", to client computer 22 in message 78. The "options page" presents a list of authorized applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 for selection by user 18 of client computer 22. The selection of one of the applications presented on the "options page" results in a message 80 being sent to DMZ proxy server 34. Message 80 is an HTTP command (over secure connection 54, thus HTTPS) that includes a composite URL comprising a base URL and an appended identifier. DMZ proxy server 34 routes message 80, based on the composite URL, to gateway proxy server in a message 82. The identifier is sufficient for gateway proxy server 40 to route message 82 to the selected application 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 (col. 9 lines 6-34); and as described above, authorization server 46 returns authentication data to gateway proxy server 40 indicative of whether the

tendered digital certificate successfully authenticated the user 18 of client computer 22, as well as an identification of applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 for which access is authorized. In response thereto, gateway proxy server 40 builds authentication cookie 90, and applications list cookie 92. Authentication cookie 90 may include information such as timestamp information indicating a time of successful authentication. Applications list cookie 92 may include an identification of the particular applications for which client computer 22 is authorized. If only one application is authorized, selected application cookie 94 is built containing a description of that application. If there are a plurality of authorized applications, however, creation of the selected-application cookie 94 is deferred until after user 18 actually selects one of the applications from the "options page". The authentication cookie 90 and the application list cookie 92 are sent with message 74 to client computer 22 via DMZ proxy server 34, with a redirect to web server 44 (col. 10 lines 6-25) wherein the DMZ proxy server and the gateway proxy server are read on the claimed gateway included notification server 220 in Figure 2; and message 74 included information about the identification of the applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 to which access by the user 18 has been authorized interpreted as notification means.

"causing the application hosting sub-system to set up a secure and authenticated connection with the gateway in response to receipt of the notification; and communicating with the initiating service via said connection" as cited herein FIG. 2; and client computer 22 requests, by way of message 76, resources from gateway web server 44. Gateway web server 44 serves up the requested resource, namely an

"options page", to client computer 22 in message 78. The "options page" presents a list of authorized applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 for selection by user 18 of client computer 22. The selection of one of the applications presented on the "options page" results in a message 80 being sent to DMZ proxy server 34. Message 80 is an HTTP command (over secure connection 54, thus HTTPS) that includes a composite URL comprising a base URL and an appended identifier. DMZ proxy server 34 routes message 80, based on the composite URL, to gateway proxy server in a message 82. The identifier is sufficient for gateway proxy server 40 to route message 82 to the selected application 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 (col. 9 lines 19-35).

As per **claim 2**, Grantges discloses "the system according to claim 16 in which the notification takes the form of a non-executable data file" as cited *client computer 22 requests, by way of message 76, resources from gateway web server 44. Gateway web server 44 serves up the requested resource, namely an "options page", to client computer 22 in message 78. The "options page" presents a list of authorized applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 for selection by user 18 of client computer 22 (col. 6 lines 36-39) interpreted as public key certificates. The selection of one of the applications presented on the "options page" results in a message 80 being sent to DMZ proxy server 34. Message 80 is an HTTP command (over secure connection 54, thus HTTPS) that includes a composite URL comprising a base URL and an appended identifier. DMZ proxy server 34 routes message 80, based on the composite URL, to gateway proxy server in a message 82. The identifier is sufficient for*

Art Unit: 2165

gateway proxy server 40 to route message 82 to the selected application 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 (col. 9 lines 19-34) wherein the options page in message 80 clearly encompasses claimed limitation.

As per **claim 8**, Grantges discloses “the system according to claim 16, wherein the first sub-system is a backend sub-system which provides services to the gateway, and” as cited herein *FIGS. 1 and 2*; and *computer system 20 is configured generally to provide access by user 18 of a client computer 22 to one of a plurality of software applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3. Such access is over an insecure network 26, such as the publicly used Internet, to a private, secure network where applications 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 reside. Each application 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 includes a respective web server (hereinafter “destination server”) 28.sub.1, 28.sub.2, . . . , 28.sub.3, and an application program 30.sub.1, 30.sub.2, . . . , 30.sub.3. Computer system 20 includes a firewall system 32, a proxy server 34 with a plug-in 36, an application gateway 38 comprising a gateway proxy server 40 with a plug-in 42 and a gateway web server 44, and an authorization server 46 (col. 4 lines 7-19) wherein each application 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 includes a respective web server 28.sub.1, 28.sub.2, . . . , 28.sub.3 clearly encompasses interpreted as backend sub-system.*

“wherein the server sub-system acts as a trusted intermediary between each application hosting sub-system and the backend sub-system” as cited herein *FIG. 6 shows information flow for a user in obtaining an X.509 digital certificate for use in the*

Art Unit: 2165

present invention. Each application 24.sub.1, 24.sub.2, . . . , 24.sub.3 has a respective trustee 134, who controls who is allowed to gain access to the application. Initially, a user 18 directs a message 136 to trustee 134, which includes information regarding the user. This communication (e.g., message 136) may be done by telephone. The trustee then provides the user with a user ID/password, with instructions to access the certificate authority 50 using the provided user ID/password. The trustee 134 then sends a message 138 to Information Security 48 that contains the information collected from the user 18, including what application(s) are being requested for remote access (col. 12 line 57 to col. 13 line 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 3, 6 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grantges in view of Gupta et al. (US Pat. No. 6,763,384 B1).

As per **claim 3**, Grantges does not explicitly disclose “the system according to claim 2 in which the notification takes the form of a simple text file containing an extensible Markup Language, XML, document”. However, Gupta et al. discloses as cited herein *in order to reduce the amount of data that needs to be sent with each*

notification, the transmitted message need contain only the changed data, for example, the amount of the winning bid for an auction site. The client then dynamically generates a display incorporating the changed data for the user to view. An example of this is when data is sent in XML (eXtensible Markup Language). XML data contains only information regarding the content and structure of a message (col. 8 lines 58-66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Gupta et al. teaching of notifying end users over a network of the occurrence of an event into Grantges system in order to notify the occurrence of an event by one or more servers to one or more client processes over a communication network (Gupta et al., col. 3 lines 13-15).

As per **claim 6**, Grantges does not explicitly disclose “the system according to claim 16 wherein a single notification server receives notifications from plural services and forwards these to plural client application hosting sub-systems”. However, Gupta et al. discloses as cited herein *FIG. 3 illustrates dataflow in an embodiment where a notification server serves multiple application servers and multiple clients (col. 4 lines 56-58); and FIG. 3 illustrates the flow of information that occurs when a message is generated. Whenever one of the application servers 20-24 generates an event for which notifications need to be sent to a client 114-118, a message monitor will inform the notification server 30. The notification server 30 determines the recipients for this notification, using the list of desired messages that the users have provided, together with the list of on-line clients 114-118. It then sends this notification using the server-*

initiated end-to-end message transfer mechanism to the receiving address identifier of the clients 114-118 (col. 8 lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Gupta et al. teaching of notifying end users over a network of the occurrence of an event into Grantges system in order to notify the occurrence of an event by one or more servers to one or more client processes over a communication network (Gupta et al., col. 3 lines 13-15).

As per **claim 18**, Grantges does not explicitly disclose “computer readable storage media containing a program or suite of computer programs for controlling one or more computer processors to carry out the steps of claim 17 during execution of the computer program or suite of programs”. However, Gupta et al. discloses as cited herein *a computer program product having a computer usable medium having a computer program embodied therein, for providing notification of the occurrence of an event over a network, said computer program product including: computer program code means for registering a set of events of interest to one or more clients and, when said one or more clients are ready to receive notification, registering their respective address identifiers with a server; computer program code means for detecting the occurrence of an event; computer program code means for identifying which of said clients are interested in notification of said event and are currently active; and computer program code means for causing a real-time connection over said network to transmit said notification to each identified client (col. 4 lines 24-42).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Gupta et al. teaching of notifying end users over a network of the occurrence of an event into Grantges system in order to notify the occurrence of an event by one or more servers to one or more client processes over a communication network (Gupta et al., col. 3 lines 13-15).

9. **Claim 4** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grantges in view of Nishizawa et al. (US Pat. No. 6,081,906 A).

As per **claim 4**, Grantges does not explicitly disclose “the system according to claim 16 wherein the notification means is operable to run separate threads for controlling the forwarding of separate notifications to the client application”. However, Nishizawa et al. discloses as cited herein *FIG. 7 is a timing chart showing multi-thread RPC processing of the event notification. The processing shown in FIG. 7 is similar to that shown in FIG. 4, except that the notification client 50 is provided with a notification N.sub.i at the conclusion of the "SendEvent" processing. Two RPC servers 20 send the first and the second RPC requests PR1 and PR2 to the notification server 40. The first and second "SendEvent" requests PR1 and PR2 arrive at the notification server 40 simultaneously, or substantially simultaneously (T1). The response thread 25 loads the first and the second "SendEvent" requests PR1 and PR2 into the queue 21 and the database 22 and immediately returns the first and the second responses R1 and R2 to the respective RPC servers 20 (T1). Processing of the first and the second RPC*

requests PR1 and PR2 then proceeds in a parallel fashion using processing threads 24.sub.1 and 24.sub.2. Because the second process request PR2 is completed in a short time (T2), for example one second, the respective notification client 50 is notified of the event without any additional delay waiting for completion of processing the first request PR1. At the conclusion of processing of the first "SendEvent" request PR1 (T3), the notification N1 is forwarded to the respective notification client 50. Thus, the delay in notifying the notification clients 50 encountered when using a single -thread notification server is also eliminated (col. 5 lines 12-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Nishizawa et al. teaching of implementing the multi-thread processing with queuing into Grantges system in order to achieve faster response time in sending notifications to clients.

10. **Claim 5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grantges in view of Osterman (US Pat. No. 5,935,211 A).

As per **claim 5**, Grantges does not explicitly disclose "the system according to claim 16, wherein the notification means includes means for permitting each service provided by the first sub-system to specify the number of times which a notification is to be retried in the event of failure to deliver the notification and means for server retrying to deliver the notification up to the specified number of times in the event of failure to deliver the notification over the non-secure network". However, Osterman discloses as

cited herein use of the time entries permits the server process to remove inactive processes from the distributed notification list. In particular, the server process may remove from the list any entry for which a predetermined time period has expired since the entry was added to the list or since the time field of the entry was updated. For example, if low frequency polling is set to occur once every 10 minutes, then the server process might remove from the list any entries that have not been updated for twenty five minutes. The server process would remove entries from the list so that server resources would not be wasted in sending notifications to client processes that are no longer connected to the server process (col. 7 lines 43-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Osterman teaching of providing status information to the client processes into Grantges system in order to provide a technique that permits client processes to reduce the frequency with which they poll the server processes. This, in turn, dramatically reduces the burden on the server process imposed by such polling (Osterman, col. 2 lines 51-54).

Conclusion

11. The examiner requests, in response to this Office Action, support is shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line number(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application.

When responding to this Office Action, applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Contact Information

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bai D. Vu whose telephone number is 571-270-1751. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30 - 6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on 571-272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Application/Control Number: 10/594,124

Page 25

Art Unit: 2165

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. D. V./
Examiner, Art Unit 2165
3/31/2009

/Christian P. Chace/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165